

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 26-50, 52-61 and 63-70 are pending in the application. Claims 26, 33, 45, 57, 66, 69 and 70 are amended. Claims 1-25, 51 and 62 were previously cancelled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

In the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, claims 26 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Utsunomiya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,101,558. Claims 33, 36-45, 48-50, 52-57, 59-61, 63-70 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Jennings et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,760,763. Claims 27-28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Utsunomiya et al. in view of Bell et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,052,380. Claims 29, 31-32 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Utsunomiya et al. in view of Jennings et al. Claims 34-35, 46-47 and 58 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Utsunomiya et al. in view of Bell et al.

Interview at USPTO of May 8, 2006

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the in person interview at the USPTO of May 8, 2006. During the interview, Applicants'

representative proposed to amend the independent claims to clearly recite that the file(s) at issue is stored in the form of a plurality of pieces of equal size, with the pieced generated from the file.

Rejections Based on Utsunomiya et al.

All of the independent claims have been amended to recite that the file or files at issue are divided into a plurality of pieces of equal size. As discussed during the interview, at least this aspect is not disclosed in Utsunomiya et al. Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, FIG. 5 of Utsunomiya et al. and the corresponding description make it clear that Utsunomiya is discussing a table of files, not a table of servers. Thus, this provides an additional distinction over Utsunomiya et al.

Rejections Based on Jennings et al.

As discussed earlier, all of the independent claims have been amended to recite that the file or files at issue are stored in the form of a plurality of equal-sized pieces. This aspect is not disclosed in Jennings et al. Additionally, Jennings deals with grouping of multiple URLs – a URL is not a piece of a file, it is a pointer to a file, see Jennings, column 8, lines 35-41.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be

withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP

/GB/

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: May 15, 2006

910 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191